

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's Office Action of April 15, 2010 issued in relation to the present Patent Application, the Applicant submits amendments to the claims and the below Remarks.

Claims 10-14, 17-21, 23 and 25-27 are presented for examination. Claims 10 and 17 are independent claims.

Regarding 35 USC 103 Rejections

Claims 10-11, 14, 17-21, 23, and 27 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiroshi (JP 2002-312149).

Claims 12, 13, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiroshi in view of Vagui (US 6,474,882), and further in view of Seseck et al. (US 2004/0085568).

Independent claim 10 as previously presented defines that "*in response to receiving the print request, the print control program simulates a keyboard sequence in the application program*", thereby causing the document to be sent to the printer for printing. Examiner appears to argue that, since the system in Hiroshi "performs the same action as simulating a keyboard sequence that also performs printing", that feature is taught by Hiroshi. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 10 does not merely define that, in response to receiving the print request, the print control program causes the document to be sent to the printer for printing, or alternatively that the print control program causes the same action to be performed as what could be performed by pressing a keyboard sequence. Claim 10 very specifically defines that "*the print control program simulates a keyboard sequence in the application program*". Even though the input (pressing a button on a printer) and the output (printing) may be the same in Hiroshi may be similar or the same, the mechanism of achieving that output is distinctly different. The limitation of simulating a keyboard sequence in an application program is not taught of suggested by Hiroshi.

The same arguments applies to independent claim 17.

In order to advance prosecution the independent claims have been further limited.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims, as amended, are allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

Kia Silverbrook

Kia Silverbrook

Paul Lapstun

Paul Lapstun

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: patentdept@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Faxsimile: +61 2 9555 7762